



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,798	10/28/2005	Luis F Angel	5660-01207	5366
35690	7590	08/16/2007		
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 398			YABUT, DIANE D	
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

H

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,798

Applicant(s)

ANGEL, LUIS F

Examiner

Diane Yabut

Art Unit

3734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29,31,33,34,38,42,45,46,48-54 and 56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29,31,33,34,38,42,45,46,48-54 and 56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 30 April 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 29, 42, 45-46, 48-51, 54, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Heyn** (U.S. Patent No. **5,201,757**).

Claims 29, 50, and 56: Heyn discloses a first conduit **44**, wherein at least a portion of an endoscope or bronchoscope, having at least a portion that is partially flexible, may be positionable in the first conduit during use, and a second conduit **20**, wherein at least a portion of the first conduit is positionable in the second conduit, wherein the second conduit is configured to contain at least a portion of a stent **18** between the distal ends of the first and second conduits, and wherein the second conduit is configurable to releasably position the stent in a body lumen or air passage during use (Figure 1, col. 5, lines 15-23).

Claim 42: Heyn discloses a stop **54** positioned approximate the distal end of the stent delivery system between the first and second conduits, wherein the stop is configured to inhibit movement of the stent in a proximal direction relative to the first conduit (Figure 1, col. 5, lines 55-58).

Art Unit: 3734

Claims 45-46: Heyn discloses at least a portion of the first and second conduits being partially flexible (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Claims 48-49: Heyn discloses at least a portion of the first and second conduits being configured to inhibit collapse of the first and second conduits upon removal of an endoscope during use (col. 5, lines 63-67 to col. 6, lines 1-5).

Claim 51: Heyn discloses the stent comprising a pulmonary stent, as in is capable of being deployed into pulmonary artery (col. 5, lines 43-54).

Claim 54: Heyn discloses the second conduit comprising a polymer (col. 5, lines 15-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Heyn (U.S. Patent No. **5,201,757**) in view of **Bui** (U.S. Patent No. **6,629,981**).

Claim 31: Heyn discloses the claimed device except for a first lock configurable to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit during use, and a second lock configurable to inhibit movement of the endoscope relative to the first conduit during use.

Bui teaches a first lock **110** configurable to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit during use, and a second lock configurable to inhibit

Art Unit: 3734

movement of the endoscope **124** relative to the first conduit during use (Figures 11, 15-17, and col. 9, lines 43-52 and col. 11, lines 8-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a first lock and a second lock, as taught by Bui, to Heyn since it was known in the art that undesirable axial movement of coaxial conduits, or sleeves, results in difficult or undesirable deployment or lack of visibility, and therefore inhibiting movement between first and second conduits facilitates deployment of the stent.

5. Claims 33-34 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heyn (U.S. Patent No. **5,201,757**) in view of Gunderson (U.S. Patent No. **5,776,142**).

Claims 33-34: Heyn discloses the claimed device except for a lock configurable to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit during use, wherein the lock comprises a first grip coupled to at least a portion of the first conduit, and a second grip coupled to at least a portion of the second conduit, and one or more pins coupled to the first conduit, wherein at least one of the pins is configurable to inhibit portions of the first and second conduits from moving transversely to each other wherein at least a portion of the first grip is configurable to inhibit movement of the second grip in a direction toward a proximal end of the stent delivery system beyond the portion of the first grip.

Gunderson teaches a lock configurable to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit during use, wherein the lock comprises a first grip **20**

coupled to at least a portion of the first conduit, and a second grip **30** coupled to at least a portion of the second conduit, and one or more pins **28** coupled to the first conduit, wherein at least one of the pins is configurable to inhibit portions of the first and second conduits from moving transversely to each other wherein at least a portion of the first grip is configurable to inhibit movement of the second grip in a direction toward a proximal end of the stent delivery system beyond the portion of the first grip (Figure 1, col. 5, lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a lock to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit, as taught by Gunderson, to Heyn since it was known in the art that the movement of the first or inner conduit relative to the second or outer conduit should be controlled so that undesirable deployment or expansion of the stent may be prevented.

Claim 53: Heyn discloses the claimed device except for the first conduit comprising a polymer.

Gunderson teaches a first conduit comprising a polymer (col. 5, lines 43-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a first conduit comprising a polymer, as taught by Gunderson, to Heyn since it was known in the art that polymer is a biocompatible, flexible material.

Art Unit: 3734

6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Heyn** (U.S. Patent No. **5,201,757**) in view of **Mikus** (U.S. Patent No. **6,093,194**).

Claim 38: Heyn discloses the claimed device except for a lock configurable to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit during use, wherein the lock comprises a clamp.

Mikus teaches a lock configurable to inhibit movement of a first conduit **70** relative to the second conduit **75** during use, wherein the lock comprises a clamp **77, 78** in order to prevent premature proximal displacement during insertion of the conduits into the body lumen (Figure 7, col. 7, lines 54-67 to col. 8, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a clamp lock, as taught by Mikus, to Heyn in order to prevent premature proximal displacement of the conduits during insertion into body lumen.

7. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Heyn** (U.S. Patent No. **5,201,757**) in view of **Quiachon** (U.S. Pat. No. **5,938,623**).

Claim 52: Heyn discloses the claimed device except for the first conduit comprising a coiled spring.

Quiachon teaches a first conduit **42** comprising a coiled spring **61** (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a coiled spring, as taught by Quiachon, to Heyn since it was known in the art that coiled springs used with conduits, sleeves, sheaths or catheters act as dampeners or absorb vibration along the length of a catheter.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 30 April 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Heyn does not appear to teach a stent delivery system comprising a first conduit wherein at least a portion of an endoscope and/or at least a portion of a bronchoscope is positionable or at least a portion of the first conduit is configured to inhibit collapse of the first conduit upon removal of the endoscope during use. The examiner disagrees. Claim 29 reads "a first conduit, wherein at least a portion of an endoscope is positionable in the first conduit during use." The examiner asserts that the recitation of an endoscope being *positionable* in a first conduit only requires that the first conduit is able to accept an endoscope to be positioned within it.

The applicant also argues that Bui does not teach or suggest a second lock configurable to inhibit movement of an endoscope relative to the first conduit during use. As maintained above, Bui teaches an endoscope that is locked into place (col. 9, lines 43-52) to inhibit relative movement relative to a first conduit during use.

Applicant argues that Gunderson does not teach or suggest one or more pins coupled to the first conduit, wherein at least one of the pins is configurable to inhibit portions of the first and second conduits from moving transversely to each other. The examiner disagrees. As maintained above, the pins or projections 28 coupled to a first conduit inhibit portions of the first and a second conduit from moving transversely to each other (Figure 1).

Art Unit: 3734

Applicant argues that Mikus does not teach or suggest a lock configurable to inhibit movement of the first conduit relative to the second conduit during use, wherein the lock comprises a clamp. The examiner disagrees. As maintained above, Mikus teaches a clamp 77, 78 that prevents premature proximal displacement during insertion of the conduits into the body lumen (col. 7, lines 54-67 and col. 8, lines 1-8).

Applicant also argues that Quiachon does not teach the first conduit comprising a coiled spring configured to inhibit collapse of the first conduit. The examiner disagrees. As maintained above, Quiachon teaches a first conduit 42 comprising a coiled spring 61 (Figure 2).

Lastly, Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane Yabut whose telephone number is (571) 272-6831. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9AM-4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3734

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MJ Hayes", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

MICHAEL J. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER